

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/846,884	05/01/2001	Richard Hayton	CTX-065	5895	
21323 75	90 10/04/2004			EXAMINER	
TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP HIGH STREET TOWER			CAO, DI	CAO, DIEM K	
125 HIGH STR	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON, MA 02110			2126		
			DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/846,884	HAYTON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Diem K Cao	2126				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 May 2001</u> .						
· —	-					
• •	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 1) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati nity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/4/02 & 3/31/03. 		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/846,884

Art Unit: 2126

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burd et al. (U.S. 6,792,607 B1) in view of Marcos et al. (U.S. 6,429,880 B2).
- 4. As to claim 1, Burd teaches an application having a plurality of objects (server-side control objects; col. 5, lines 1-25), at least one object having a property (the server-side Control class ... properties and events; col. 19, line 58 col. 20, line 2), each property being identified with an identifier (page:tablelist1:listrow2:label1; col. 14, lines 49-54), associating at least one property path with one inserted element of the user interface (one or more server-side control objects map to one or more user interface element; col. 6, line 66 col. 7, line 2 and Operation 508 parses the payload ... for processing; col. 14, lines 49-65), the property path including a concatenation of a plurality of identifiers (page, tablelist1, listrow2, label1; col. 14, lines 49-54), the concatenation of identifiers defining a path through the objects of the application to a property at the end of the concatenation (the property values of server-side control objects or corresponding data, i.e., "12945"; col. 14, lines 49-67 and Figs. 6-7).

5. However, Burd does not teach components, and inserting at least one element into the user-interface. Marcos teaches components (components; col. 9, lines 35-51), and inserting at least one element into the user interface (Element section 504 ... generate template 330; col. 9, lines 35-44 and Instances of palette can be used to drag and drop HTML elements into the main component; col. 12, lines 45-46).

- 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burd and Marcos because it provides a method for binding user interface objects to application objects visually, and both objects or components are software objects that provide properties and methods to act on the properties, and it is easier for developers during application creation and maintain.
- As to claim 2, Burd does not teach determining a list of property paths associated with the application, and selecting the property path from the list to associate with the one inserted element of the user-interface from the list of property path. Marcos teaches determining a list of property paths associated with the application (Object browser ... to the HTML INPUT element; col. 10, lines 55-57 and col. 11, lines 61-64), and selecting the property path from the list to associate with the one inserted element of the user-interface from the list of property path (Binding flow; col. 14, line 45 col. 15, line 14).

Application/Control Number: 09/846,884 Page 4

Art Unit: 2126

- 8. **As to claim 3**, Burd does not teach receiving a property path description file associated with the application, the property path description file including a plurality of identifiers associated with the application and a relationship between the plurality of identifiers. Marcos teaches receiving a property path description file associated with the application, the property path description file including a plurality of identifiers associated with the application and a relationship between the plurality of identifiers (e.g. col. 8, lines 1-27; col. 9, lines 45-59; col. 10, lines 55-64 and col. 13, lines 42-47).
- 9. **As to claim 4**, Burd teaches executing the application, and interacting with the executing application to determine a plurality of identifiers associated with the application and a relationship between the plurality of identifiers (e.g. col. 5, lines 1-25; col. 10, lines 13-35 and col. 14, lines 49-54 and Figs. 1, 6-7).
- 10. **As to claim 5**, Burd teaches transmitting a request to register for a property change message corresponding to the property path associated with the element of the user-interface (e.g. col. 10, lines 60-67 and col. 15, lines 1-17).
- 11. **As to claim 6**, Burd does not teach providing at least one predefined element, and enabling selection from the at least one predefined element to insert the selected predefined element into the user interface (Element section 504 ... generate template 330; col. 9, lines 35-44 and Instances of palette can be used to drag and drop HTML elements into the main component; col. 12, lines 45-46).

- 12. **As to claim 7**, Marcos teaches the predefined element comprises one of an image type user-interface element, an iterator type user-interface element, a text type user-interface element, a hidden type user-interface element, a value type user-interface element, a slider type user-interface element, a tree view type user-interface element, a button type user interface element, an iframe type user-interface element, a tab type user-interface element, a flipflop type user-interface element, a desk type user-interface element, a dropdown type user-interface element, a radio type user-interface element, and a script type user-interface element (See Figs. 4A-4D, 5, 7, col. 6, lines 35-49, col. 8, line 28 col. 9, line 16).
- 13. As to claim 8, it corresponds to the method claim of claim 1 above and is rejected under the same rejection.
- 14. As to claims 9-14, see rejections of claims 2-7 above.
- 15. As to claim 15, Burd teaches the client node including a user interface having one or more elements (Fig. 1). However, Burd does not teach the client node including a client portion of the property connector module. Marcos teaches the client node including a client portion of the property connector module (component window; col. 9, line 30 col. 10, line 19).

16. **As to claim 16**, Burd as modified teaches the server node including the application, and a server portion of the property connector module (server-side class control library; col. 6, lines 62-66, non-user-interface server component 130; col. 7, lines 46-48).

Conclusion

- 17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Emmelmann (U.S. 2003/0074634 A1) teaches a method to create server side Internet application by placing interactive server side components on Internet pages.
 - Turner et al. (U.S. 2001/0018648 A1) teaches "a method and system for assembling and utilizing components in component object systems".
- 18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220 or (571) 272-3760 (effective November 1st 2004). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thursday, 9:00AM 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678 or (571) 272-3756 (effective November 1st 2004). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Diem Cao

MENG-AL T. AN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100